Distance Education, 07:11 PM 2/18/99, Fw: Distance Learning Comments

```
From: "Distance Education Study" < disted@loc.gov>
To: < jfed@loc.gov>
Subject: Fw: Distance Learning Comments
Date: Thu, 18 Feb 1999 19:11:39 -0500
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
----Original Message----
From: Andrew Beckerman-Rodau < arodau@sylvania.sev.org>
To: disted@loc.gov < disted@loc.gov>
Cc: arodau@onu.edu < arodau@onu.edu>
Date: Friday, January 15, 1999 6:21 PM
Subject: Distance Learning Comments
> TO: U.S. Copyright Office
> FROM: Professor Andrew Beckerman-Rodau, Ohio Northern University Pettit
> College of Law, Ada, Ohio
> SUBJECT: Digital Millennium Copyright Act - Comments with regard to
> Distance Learning
> DATE: January 15, 1999
> The Digital Millennium Copyright Act identifies 8 factors to consider with
> regard to distance learning. The number of each comment below corresponds
> to the same number factor in the Act.
>
> (1) The existing Copyright Act already recognizes the need for an exemption
> from certain copyright rights for educational activities conducted at
> non-profit educational institutions. Section 110(1) of the Act provides
> that the "performance" or "display" of a copyrighted work by instructors or
> students in the course of face-to-face teaching activities in a classroom
> or similar place devoted to instruction is not copyright infringement. This
> exemption enables educators to perform or display copyrighted works without
> permission of the copyright owner. However, it does not allow the educator
> to make copies of the copyrighted work. Arguably, this provides a balance
> between the rights of copyright owners and the needs of educators.
> Typically, the educator's use should have minimal effect on the market
> value of the copyrighted work since the educator is limited to performing
> or displaying the work in class. The owner still has the right to recover
> most of the economic value of the work by selling copies of it.
>
> The Copyright Act also provides another educational exemption for
```

> non-profit institutions. It allows certain copyrighted works used in an > educational context to be performed or displayed in a classroom even if > they are transmitted from a remote site via a computer network. (See > Copyright Act section 110(2)). This section is really an extension of > section 110(1) discussed above. Section 110(2), like section 110(1) above, > requires the performance or display of the copyrighted work to occur in a > classroom. Both exemptions are modeled on the traditional notion of > teaching taking place in a face-to-face environment in a classroom. > > Distance learning can be viewed as a mere extension of the classroom. Under > this approach the existing exemption in sections 110(1) & (2), above, could > be extended to apply to distance learning over a computer network or system > in addition to face-to-face teaching in a classroom. Arguably, the distance > learning environment can be viewed as a mere substitute for the classroom. > The actual locations of the instructor and students would be immaterial. As > long as the instructors and students are engaged in an educational activity > that is being used in lieu of a face-to-face meeting in a classroom it > should be included in the above exemptions. > > (2) Most copyrighted works should be included under a distance learning > exemption which permits the "performance" or "display" of a copyrighted > work by instructors in an educational environment. However, copyrighted > materials which are produced exclusively for educational use in a classroom > should not be subject to such an exemption. Application of a distance > learning exemption to such materials could effectively destroy the market > for such materials. The result of this would be a significant reduction in > the availability of educational materials. Alternatively, a distance > learning exemption could apply to educational materials; but the exemption > should be more restricted when applied to such materials in contrast to its > application to other materials. The key is to allow educators to freely use > copyrighted materials as educational tools while maintaining a viable > market for copyrighted materials. > > (3) Quantitative limits on the amount of a copyrighted work that an > educator could use under a distance learning exemption are difficult to set > in the abstract. One approach would be to develop a flexible approach such > as that utilized in a "fair use" analysis under section 107 of the > Copyright Act. Under a fair use analysis the amount of a copyrighted work > that is utilized is merely one factor in determining if the use is a "fair > use" and therefore excluded from being copyright infringement. The primary > factor in determining whether something is a "fair use" is an evaluation of > the impact of the use on the economic market for the copyrighted work. If > the market impact is substantial it is unlikely "fair use" will be found.

Distance Education, 07:11 PM 2/18/99, Fw: Distance Learning Comments

> In contrast, if the market impact is minimal "fair use" is likely to be > found. The same market impact analysis could be utilized to determine > whether the amount of a copyrighted work utilized under a distance learning > exemption is acceptable or not. Nevertheless, this approach may stifle > development of distance learning since an educator may be uncertain with > regard to how much of a copyrighted work she can safely use. Another > approach would be to create clear quantitative guidelines. Such guidelines > were previously developed with regard to "fair use" of copyrighted work for > educational activities. However, unlike those guidelines, the resulting > guidelines could then be adopted as regulations of the Copyright Office and > enacted as part of the Code of Federal Regulations. If such distance > learning guidelines are developed with the input of copyright owners and > non-profit educational institutions they should adequately balance the > interests of the various parties. > (4) The benefits of any distance learning exemption should apply to > instructors participating in a distance learning course offered by a > non-profit educational institution. Additionally, the non-profit > educational institution sponsoring the distance learning course should be > entitled to the benefits of the exemption. > (5) Any distance learning exemption should be limited to an organized > distance learning course sponsored by a non-profit educational institution. > Therefore, only students enrolled in a specific distance learning course > should be designated as recipients of distance learning materials under the > exemption. > > (6) An distance learning exemption permitting use of copyrighted works > should require minimal technological safeguards to control future > unauthorized use of such works. The rapidity of technology changes makes > drafting a rule requiring safeguards problematic. Consequently, the > distance learning exemption should require that "reasonable" technological > safeguards should be utilized to: (a) minimize unauthorized access to > copyrighted materials by those not enrolled in the distance learning > course; and (b) limit the ability of those enrolled in the course to > retransmit copyrighted material to third parties. A "reasonable" standard > could then be defined or interpreted to mean whatever is commercially > and/or economically reasonable under the current state of technology. For > example, at the present time access to distance learning material can be > limited by requiring students enrolled in a distance learning course to > have a username and password which must be provided to access the > materials. Alternatively, if the distance learning materials are provided > via the Web access can be limited to specific domains or to specific IP

```
> addresses.
>
> (7) If a license for a copyrighted work can not be reasonably obtained the
> distance learning exemption should apply to the work. In contrast, if a
> license is easily obtainable at a reasonable price the need for a distance
> learning exemption for the copyrighted work decreases. Such an approach
> might encourage copyright owners to develop a simple and fast method of
> obtaining a license to utilize materials for distance learning. The
> advantage of this approach is that it allows the marketplace to develop
> mechanisms to balance the economic interests of copyright owners with the
> educational needs of non-profit educational institutions. In contrast, a
> compulsory licensing scheme could be developed for copyrighted works used
> in a distance learning context. Under this approach standard license terms
> and royalty rates would be set periodically by the Copyright Office. This
> approach has already been adopted for certain types of copyrighted works in
> other contexts.
>
> (8) The application of the work-for-hire doctrine with regard to the
> ownership of any copyrights in distance learning materials should be
> directly dealt with. Typically, distance learning materials will be created
> by instructors who are employed by non-profit educational institutions.
> Under the work-for-hire doctrine the determination of whether copyright
> ownership vests in the instructors creating the materials or the
> institutions who employ the instructors is unclear. Under the U.S. Supreme
> Court's interpretation of the doctrine generally its application turns on
> an analysis of the employment relationship between the instructor and the
> institution. This approach produces significant uncertainty in general.
> Additionally, this is an issue that should be specifically studied to
> determine if the relationship between a professor and an educational
> institution should be treated the same as an ordinary employment
> relationship. Or, is such a relationship significantly different to justify
> special treatment.
>
>
>
>
> Andrew Beckerman-Rodau
> Professor of Law
> Ohio Northern University
> Pettit College of Law
> Ada, Ohio 45810 USA
```

Distance Education, 07:11 PM 2/18/99, Fw: Distance Learning Comments